

### **REMARKS**

Claims 1-45 are pending in this application. In an Office Action mailed March 19, 2007 ("OA"), the Examiner rejected claims 1-45. With this response, Applicants amend claims 1, 9-12, 16, 24-27, 31, and 39-42. Applicants respectfully traverse the rejections and request reconsideration based on the following remarks.

In addition, Applicants do not necessarily agree with or acquiesce in the Examiner's characterization of the claims or the prior art, even if those characterizations are not addressed herein.

#### **Examiner Interview dated April 19, 2007**

Applicants thank the Examiner for reviewing a proposed amendment to claim 1 prior to the Examiner Interview dated April 19, 2007. During the interview, the Examiner indicated that the proposed amendment would overcome the prior art. In this response, Applicants incorporate the proposed amendment into claims 1-45.

#### **Specification**

The Examiner objected to the title because it is allegedly not descriptive. With this response, as provided on page 2 of this paper, Applicants amend the title to "Methods and Systems for Preventing Unauthorized Modifications." Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to withdraw the objection.

#### **Drawings**

The Examiner objected to Figures 3-5 because they allegedly are prior art. While a general computer, general components of a computer, and a general computer system are all prior art, Applicants are providing Figures 3-5 to illustrate a computer,

components of a computer, and a computer system that incorporate the Applicants' claimed invention. Applicants' specification at paragraphs 11-13 and 56-58. If the Applicants amend Figures 3-5 by labeling them as prior art, as suggested by the Examiner, Applicants would in essence be designating the claims as prior art because the computer, components of the computer, and the computer system incorporate the Applicants' claimed invention. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to withdraw the objection to the drawings.

**Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 102**

The Examiner rejected claims 1-45 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by "The Java Virtual Machine Specification" by Lindholm et al. ("Lindholm"). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

During the interview, the Examiner indicated that the amendments to claims 1-45 would overcome the prior art. Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 1-45 are patentable over the cited prior art.

**CONCLUSION**

In view of the foregoing remarks, Applicants submit that this claimed invention, as amended, is neither anticipated nor rendered obvious in view of the prior art references cited against this application. Applicants therefore request the entry of this Amendment, the Examiner's reconsideration and reexamination of the application, and the timely allowance of the pending claims.

Please grant any extensions of time required to enter this response and charge any additional required fees to our Deposit Account No. 06-0916.

Respectfully submitted,

FINNEGAN, HENDERSON, FARABOW,  
GARRETT & DUNNER, L.L.P.

Dated: May 7, 2007

By: 

Aaron J. Capron  
Reg. No. 56,170